



LD

5025

.8

.H3

Author

Title

Imprint



Am. H. M. Bevanpene

Hayne, Robert Young.
"

APPEAL

IN BEHALF OF THE

SOUTH-CAROLINA COLLEGE.



26.8

THE Subscribers, Trustees of the South-Carolina College, have seen with deep regret, the recent attacks made upon the Board, and the newly elected Professors of that Institution. The avowed object of these attacks, is to deprive the College of public confidence, to induce parents not only to "withhold their sons from being placed under the present Faculty, but that they should use all their influence to withhold the sons of others." As the success of these efforts must be fatal to an Institution, which is deemed by us, essential to the honour and welfare of the State, we feel ourselves called upon, to make an effort for its preservation.

In the course of a series of articles which have appeared in the columns of the "Christian Herald," and the "Charleston Observer," the attempt has been made to show that under the present organization, the College is "put in hostile array against all Christian influence;" the Professors are charged with being men without religion, and the course pursued by the Board of Trustees, in the late election of Professors, is ascribed to "strong feelings of hostility to the Christian religion—a noted contempt and rancorous hatred of the clergy,"—and all this while it is *admitted* that "most of the Board are certainly friendly to the cause of religion." So indiscriminate has been the censure of the proceedings of the Board, that even the remodelling of the former Professorship of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy and the Evidences of Christianity, at their meeting in June last, and the establishment of a Professorship of

F
J

L1 502
8
H3

“ SACRED LITERATURE AND THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY,” and the filling that important Professorship with a CLERGYMAN of acknowledged piety and eloquence—charged with the instruction of the students in Sacred Literature, and the stated performance of Divine service in the College Chapel, has been denounced as being “only a more determined prosecution of the anti-christian policy of former years,”—a measure founded on “deep design,” and intended to “blindfold, and stultify the Christian community.”

Against charges such as these, and others of a like character, the Subscribers, would, so far as they are personally concerned, deem it unnecessary to make any reply. We have lived in vain, if, at this period of our lives, it could be necessary for us to repel such imputations. At the meeting in June last, there were no less than twenty-three Trustees present, viz: The Governør of the State, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Judges Desaussure, Johnson, O'Neill, Harper, Butler and Evans; General Hayne, General Hamilton, General Thompson, Colonel Hampton, Colonel P. M. Butler, Dr. Fisher, Solicitors Thompson T. Player, Franklin Elmore, and Thomas J. Withers; Messrs. D. L. Wardlaw, James Gregg, D. J. McCord, C. P. Bookter, Thomas W. Glover, and William F. Desaussure; and it may surely be asked whether it is at all *credible*, that these gentlemen could possibly have been influenced in the fulfilment of their high trust, by the motives which have been imputed to the Board? It is a melancholy reflection, that the best efforts of disinterested men, anxious to do right, and taking vast pains to do so, should be so grossly misrepresented, and harshly censured, by those who have not even taken the pains to be correctly informed. The imputation that the Trustees did not desire, to place religious men in the Professors chairs, and that they selected Dr. Capers, (a man of known piety,) merely as “a cloak to their design, to introduce *infidels* in all the other departments,” is utterly unfounded; and the imputation of infidelity upon the newly elected Professors, is made without knowledge, gratuitously, and hardly in that spirit of Christian charity which “thinketh no evil.”

Having said thus much, we come at once to an examination of the main charges which have been preferred against the College, and will give such explanations as we trust may prove satisfactory. We repeat, it is not our object merely to defend ourselves, or our colleagues. We have another, and far higher, aim—the restoration of the College to public confidence, by refuting erroneous statements, and removing groundless prejudices. We believe that the South-

Carolina College, which has at all times been intimately connected with the dearest interests of the State, has now become indispensable to her safety. It is upon our moral and intellectual resources that the South must mainly rely for the support of her just rights, and that *equal station* in the Confederacy which is essential to her honour and welfare. At **THIS CRISIS** the support of our College, as furnishing the means of training up, amidst all the endearing associations of home, the youth who are to be the guardians of their country, when those who now uphold her shall be swept from the stage, is one of the highest duties of patriotism. It is this great duty which we shall now attempt to perform. We shall do it in perfect singleness of heart, and, we trust, in a becoming spirit. The anxious solicitude of the Christian community, with regard to the religious character of this institution—and even the unmerited censures to which the conduct of the Board has been subjected, will not be treated by us as imputations, to be indignantly repelled, but as objections to be removed. The Board of Trustees, scattered as they are throughout the State, cannot, at this season, be brought together or generally consulted. We cheerfully assume, therefore, the responsibility of making this appeal to all the good people of the State, without distinction of sect, denomination, or party, in behalf of that cherished object of our affections, the South-Carolina College. We ask, only—and that not in behalf of ourselves, but of the great Literary Institution of our State—a patient hearing and a candid judgment. The grave charge brought against the College, the Trustees, and the Faculty, is in substance this,—**THAT THE INSTITUTION IS ANTI-CHRISTIAN IN ITS CHARACTER AND TENDENCY:** that it is in fact in the hands of men who are fatally bent on making it a school of infidelity. The existing controversy is indeed expressly charged to be a “contest between Christians and Infidels;” and the true question at issue, “whether the College shall be thrown into the scale of Christianity or Infidelity?—a question (which, it is very properly added) resolves itself into another, whether we shall have a College or not?” In support of this charge, it is alleged, that the election of Dr. COOPER as President, and the rejection of the Rev. Dr. M'AULEY fifteen years ago, was designed to put down the influence of religious men—that the whole conduct of the Trustees ever since has manifested a settled hostility to the Clergy—and that the proceedings of the present Board, at their meeting in June last, prove, conclusively, that they are still animated by the same spirit. Let us now briefly examine the proofs adduced in support of this sweeping charge. It may be well to premise, however, that it can

C 2 8 8 7
 S. W. Recat. 30 S. 93

hardly be expected that we should follow our assailants in a Review of the History of the College, for the last fifteen years. The present Board of Trustees are in no way responsible for the measures adopted by their predecessors. Some of the Trustees have been connected with the College for only a few years; and a majority of the present Board had no participation in, or personal knowledge of, many of the transactions which have been referred to. It would, certainly, be doing all, therefore, that could reasonably be expected of us, at this time, to show that the College, under the arrangement effected in December and June last, is entitled to public confidence and support; and that the charge of its being calculated or intended, *as at present organized*, to exert an influence unfavourable to Christianity, is wholly unfounded. Surely if the influence which formerly existed was of a deleterious character, the present Board must rather be entitled to praise than censure, for having earnestly set about the work of reform. If the election of Dr. COOPER afforded just ground of complaint, surely the withdrawal of that gentleman from all connexion with the Institution, should be regarded as a circumstance manifesting a disposition on the part of the present Board to meet the wishes of the Christian community. So far, therefore, as relates to the past history of the College, we shall rest satisfied with merely correcting one or two erroneous statements.

It has been assumed, that during the first fifteen years of its existence, the College was organized on *a different principle*, from that which has subsequently prevailed; and evidence that the Institution was *then* devoted to the cause of Christianity, has been found in the alleged fact, that "a course of instruction on the Evidences of Christianity was provided for in the act of Incorporation—that regular preaching and prayer were enjoined; and, above all, that the President, and nearly all the Professors, during the period of fifteen years, were either Ministers of the Gospel, or laymen of decided piety." Now the truth is, that no such provision is to be found in the charter, nor did a single regulation ever exist with regard to religious exercises or instruction, which is *not now provided for in the College*;—it is an error to assert that nearly all the Professors "were Ministers of the Gospel or laymen of decided piety;" the truth is, that objections were *then* constantly made, as they are *now*, against "the want of a Religious influence in the College," and the venerable President himself did not escape these unfounded imputations. The next allegation is, that on the death of Dr. Maxcy "an unaccountable revolution took place in the views of the Trustees, and suddenly there was manifested a settled determination *to exclude*

religious men and religious influence from the Institution." In support of this change, the election of Dr. COOPER over the head of the Rev. Dr. M'AULEY, is triumphantly adduced. Now it would be more natural, and certainly more charitable, to suppose, that Dr. COOPER might have been indebted for his election to his high character for science and learning, the recommendation of Mr. JEFFERSON, and his acknowledged skill as a chemist; which one of the assailants of the College candidly acknowledges might very reasonably have influenced their choice, than to attribute it to a revolution in opinion and feeling, which all would admit to be "unaccountable." The truth, however, is, that the Rev. Dr. M'AULEY *was not rejected*. It has been shown by the statements of Chancellor DESAUSSURE and Col. BLANDING, already published, that Dr. M'AULEY *was not a candidate*, when Dr. COOPER was elected; and if it had not been for the conduct of the Rev. CHARLTON HENRY, in absolutely withdrawing his name, that there is any reason to believe he would have been elected: and so, the proof of a change in the views of the Board, founded on the *rejection of the Rev. Dr. M'Auley*, falls to the ground. We will only here add our belief, that great as Dr. COOPER's reputation was, and popular as he had become as Professor of Chemistry in our own College, he never would have been advanced to the Presidency, if any apprehension had been felt, that this would lead to the existence of any influence unfavourable to Christianity.

We have no hesitation in stating our conviction, that in no single instance, has any Clergyman ever been refused a Professorship on account of his sacred Profession; on the contrary, we do firmly believe, that with equal claims in all other respects, a Clergyman would generally have been preferred. Clergymen have never been, and are not now proscribed. The number of Clergymen connected with instruction in the College, has been pretty much the same through the whole period of its history. Passing over the Rev. Dr. MAXCY, who for a period of fifteen years presided over the Institution, —we have had among the Professors, the Rev. Drs. MONTGOMERY, BROWN, HANCKEL, WALLACE, HENRY, and CAPERS, and yet the Board is charged with a determined hostility to the Clergy.

Coming down to the present time, we now proceed to examine the charges preferred against the College in reference to the *new organization* effected, and the elections made at the meeting of the Board in December and June last. To a clear understanding of the proceedings of the Board on these occasions, it is proper to premise, that the College had been declining for several years. That the imputation of infidelity which

had attached to Dr. COOPER,—the supposed laxity of discipline,—the ruinous condition of the College buildings—and other causes not necessary to be here stated,—had so impaired the popularity of the Institution, that the number of students had been greatly reduced, and the necessity of taking prompt and decisive measures to restore the institution to public confidence, seemed to be generally felt and acknowledged. At the stated meeting of the Board in December, a Committee was appointed to inquire into the causes of the decline of the institution, and to devise measures for the improvement of its condition. This Committee, after the most patient examination, and extensive inquiries, made a report to the Board, recommending the vacation of the offices of all the Professors, and that new elections should be held to fill the vacancies thus created. The Rev. Mr. HENRY had previously given notice of his intention to resign, and the other Professors, on receiving an intimation of the views of the Board, all promptly resigned, and the College was thus left without a Faculty. As it was manifestly impossible to fill all the vacancies immediately, some provision became necessary to prevent the exercises from being suspended, and the Students sent home. Temporary arrangements were accordingly made with some of the former Professors, for the instruction of the several classes in Chemistry, Mathematics, and the Languages. Two of these Professors, viz: the Rev. ROBERT HENRY, and Mr. HENRY J. NOTT, the former Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy and the Evidences of Christianity, and the latter Professor of Logic, Belles Lettres, and the Philosophy of Languages, it was proposed to retain, and to this arrangement no objection, as far as we know, was *then urged*, in or out of the Board.—Mr. HENRY, however, it was found, would not consent to remain in any other station than the Presidency, an office, which in the condition of the College at that time, the Trustess did not think proper to fill. Mr. NOTT, against whom no complaints were then urged,—who as a Professor, had fulfilled his duties to the entire satisfaction of all, was re-elected, almost unanimously, and he continued from December to June to fulfil the duties of his office in a manner creditable to himself and the institution, and without, as far as we know, any objection being publicly urged against him. But the Trustees did not stop here. Having understood that Professor DEW, of Virginia, Mr. COGSWELL (then of Raleigh,) and Professor DAVIES, of West Point, all gentlemen of high reputation and distinguished talents, would accept respectively, the Professorships of Political Economy, Ancient Languages, and Mathematics; these gentlemen were accordingly elected

to these several stations, in the hope, that by these arrangements, the College would be restored to public confidence, and extensive usefulness. We have heard of no imputations from any quarter upon these gentlemen, and we must, therefore, presume, that if they had accepted their appointments, (as the Board had every reason to expect,) we should have escaped the censure which has since been thrown upon our proceedings. In order, however, to give some colour to these censures, there very proceedings, against which not a whisper of discontent was heard for upwards of six months, are *now* exhibited in the following odious point of view—with what justice the public will decide. Keeping entirely out of view the fact, that Messrs. DEW, COGSWELL, and DAVIES, all believed to be “religious men,” were elected at the same time with Professor NOTT, and concealing the fact, that the Rev. ROBERT HENRY was also at the same time, offered the Professorship which he had so long held—it is merely stated that Professor HENRY was “dismissed without ceremony,” while Professor NOTT was retained—and the re-organization is represented as consisting simply in the *expulsion of the pious members of the Faculty*, (especially Dr. HENRY, and Dr. PARK) and retaining those of an opposite character. Now we have shewn that these new Professors, all admitted to be unexceptionable, were elected at the same time with Professor NOTT, and that Professor HENRY was not “dismissed,” but offered to be retained. To all this we will add, that though the assailants of the College now hold up Dr. HENRY as the representative of the religious community, and adduce what they commonly call his “rejection,” as an evidence of the anti-religious tendency of the Board, yet it is notorious, that Dr. HENRY himself did not, while in the College, entirely escape the imputation of a want of orthodoxy—an imputation which we believe to be altogether unfounded, but which it is worthy of remark, has only ceased to be urged, since his connexion with the College has been dissolved. The excellent Dr. MAXCY himself could not, while President of the College, escape similar imputations. With regard to the venerable Dr. PARK, whose name has been unnecessarily brought into this discussion, we will merely remark, that his age and infirmities were considered by himself, as well as his friends, as presenting an insuperable obstacle to his re-election. He was not a candidate, and expressly declared “that the Board ought not to elect him, and that he could not conscientiously accept of the appointment if they did.” And yet his retirement, under such circumstances, with a provision for his old age, and every possible mark of attachment and respect, has been held up as affording conclusive evidence

of the "anti-religious tendencies of the Board." Such is a brief history of the proceedings of the Board at their *meeting in December last*. Unfortunately for the College, however, the newly elected Professors declined accepting their appointments—and at the special meeting in June, the Trustees found the College under the care of Professor NOTT, (who still retained the Professorship of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres,) assisted by the Rev. Dr. CAPERS, (who at the instance of a Committee of the Trustees, had undertaken temporarily to instruct in Moral Philosophy,) and of the other gentlemen who had been requested by the Board to continue their instructions until the newly elected Professors should enter upon the duties of their offices. The College was now surrounded with difficulties, which the Trustees had to grapple with, as well as they could. A Committee had been appointed by the Board to inquire for suitable candidates to fill the vacancies in the Institution, and great exertions had been made to fulfil that duty. Circulars had been despatched in all quarters, and every possible effort made to secure to the College the services of the most eminent men to be found in the United States. To show the uncommon pains taken on this subject, we will here state that the names of upwards of thirty gentlemen were brought before the Board, and so numerous were the recommendations, that it occupied the Board two days to read and examine them. If the assailants of the College had *seen these testimonials*—if they had witnessed the anxious inquiries of the Board into the characters and qualifications of the Candidates, and could have realized the difficulty and delicacy of making the selection; if they had been aware of the sincere desire felt by the Board, to fulfil their high trust with a single eye to the welfare of the Institution, and the best interests of the State, we must have been spared the harsh and injurious animadversions which have been made upon the conduct of the Board. The task of selecting among rival candidates, is at all times a difficult and delicate one; and when the relative claims and qualifications of learned and scientific men, are to be weighed and adjusted, it is manifestly impossible to make any decision which may not be open to objections. Our opponents, therefore, by dwelling with warm, and we doubt not, deserved eulogy, upon the character and claims of the gentlemen who were passed over, and at the same time, instituting a severe scrutiny into the pretensions of the gentlemen elected, without even looking at the recommendations which were before the Board; may find it an easy task to excite suspicion, and create prejudice, but we will venture to say, that if they had been themselves members of the Board, they would most probably have concurred in

their proceedings, certain it is, that the election of Dr. LIEBER, against which the strongest objections have been urged, was made *unanimously*—and the creation of the Professorship of Sacred Literature, which is held up as affording evidence of “a more determined hostility to Christianity,” was adopted with but a single dissenting voice, and it is not denied that “most of the Board are certainly friendly to Religion,” and some of them the very “pillars of the Church.” We cannot be induced, even to shield ourselves from unmerited imputations, to wound the feelings of honorable men, by instituting an odious comparison between the acquirements, and intellectual, and moral qualities, of all the candidates, whose names were before the Board. We can only say, the claims of all were *fairly considered*, and the decision *impartially made*, we trust without the slightest imputation upon the character of any gentleman who was not elected. It was impossible to select five or six Professors, out of thirty candidates, and give universal satisfaction. To give occasion to cavil, and some ground for plausible, if not substantial objections, was unavoidable. But this we fearlessly assert, that the choice was, in every single instance, directed by an honest desire of selecting as Professors, the men in all respects best qualified for the stations to which they were appointed. The Trustees could have no “personal ends” to answer, and could not have been, and were not influenced in their choice, by favour or affection, for men who were for the most part, known to them only by their general reputation. It is not, *and cannot be true*, that any desire was felt by the Board to exclude the graduates of our own College, and to select gentlemen from abroad, *in preference* to those at home. It is unjust, to suppose, that the Trustees of the South-Carolina College—many of them graduates of that institution—all southern men—*Carolinians*, not only in name, but in heart, could have been actuated by so unworthy a spirit. More monstrous still, is the supposition that a body of respectable and well informed men, entertaining a high respect for religion, many of them communicants in the Churches to which they belong, and all of them deeply impressed with the vital importance of strengthening the religious and moral influences of society, could have been guilty of organizing the College, and electing Professors, with a view to the extension of an anti-religious influence.

We have shewn, as far as we have gone, that these charges are unsupported. We will now proceed to examine some other arguments which have been urged in support of them. The sum and substance of the charges against the newly elected Professors, is, that

they are not "religious men." We meet the objection, by asking on what authority this charge has been made? When originally urged, the assailants did not even pretend to be acquainted with their religious principles, and yet *in the absence of all proof*, and without knowledge, respectable men were publicly denounced, as not fit to be trusted with the education of our children? But before we proceed to investigate this charge of a want of religion, so strongly urged against the newly elected Professors, we pause to inquire *what is the rule*, which it is desired that the Trustees should observe in appointments connected with the College? Is it contended that no man shall have any connexion with the institution who is not "a religious man," by which the objectors understand a man of "evangelical faith," and of "vital experimental religion?" If such a rule were adopted, is it not obvious that the Board must be transferred into an ecclesiastical body, undertaking to determine the *orthodoxy* of men's religious opinions? or that they must submit to be governed by the decision of some ecclesiastical tribunal? If a man *professing a belief in the Christian Religion*, shall be found faithful in the performance of all the relative and social duties of life—maintaining in his intercourse with the world, the character of a virtuous and honest man,—can we undertake to look beyond this, to discover his "religious principles?" Can any other standard be proposed which would not necessarily degenerate into sectarianism? Would a Catholic, a Unitarian, a member of the Society of Friends, however learned and pious, come up to the standard of the writers in the "Observer," and the "Herald?" But we have seen in the case of Dr. LIEBER, that even an open profession of religion, a membership of a Christian Church, accompanied by a life above reproach, is not deemed sufficient to establish the required religious character. Dr. ELLET too (also said to be a member of the Church, and against whom nothing has been alleged,) falls below the standard. Mr. TWISS, and Mr. STUART, gentleman of irreproachable moral character, and not even suspected of infidelity, *not being Professors of religion*, are also denounced. Gentlemen in the warmth of their zeal, overlook the obvious difficulties which lie in their way, and seem not to perceive that in denouncing the new Professors, (not one of whom is even suspected of infidelity,) they have taken upon themselves to set up a *standard of their own*, which has never been applied to any literary institution in this country. The truth is, that however deniable it might be, to conform to the views of the opponents of the College, the Trustees *dare not even go* so far as to say, that none but members of the Church

shall ever be admitted to a Professorship in our College. Ours is strictly a literary and scientific, and not an ecclesiastical institution. It is supported by the friends of all denominations and all classes in the community, and none can be rightfully excluded from its offices. Although there is no such provision in *our charter*, yet it is expressly declared in the charters of the Charleston and Beaufort College, that "no person shall be excluded from any liberty, or privilege, *office*, or situation, in said College, on account of his religious persuasion, provided he demean himself in a sober, peaceable, and orderly manner," &c.—a provision which clearly shows the sense of the Legislature on this subject. When, therefore, gentlemen would exclude from Professorships in our College, such men as Professors LIEBER, ELLET, STUART, and TWISS, two of them professors, and all of them understood to be avowed believers in the Christian Religion, men too of unexceptionable moral character, on the ground that they are "not religious men"—they are laying down a rule applicable only to sectarian and ecclesiastical institutions.

We are pleased to be able to state, that one at least of the writers who have assailed the College, has substantially admitted the correctness of these views. The editor of the "Christian Herald" declares, "that no man should be excluded merely for a want of religion,—nay, more, (says he,) I would not exclude a *pious Jew* from holding a Professorship in the College, provided his literary attainments justly entitled him to the place—all I ask is, that the prevailing influence be in favour of Religion. To Mr. ELLET and Mr. STUART, (adds this writer,) we know of no objections, taken in connexion with other members of a Faculty, in whose piety the religious community had confidence. We do not know that they would treat religion with disrespect, or exert any positive influence against it. For ought then that we know to the contrary—these men, *eminent for their qualifications*, OUGHT TO BE SUSTAINED." The issue here presented we are willing to meet. Brought to this standard, we are quite sure the re-organization of the College will stand the test of scrutiny. At the same time, that Messrs. LIEBER, ELLET, STUART and TWISS, were elected, a Professorship of "Sacred Literature and the Evidences of Christianity" was created, and filled with a Clergyman of *acknowledged piety*, and distinguished talents, who was charged with the special duty of *religious instruction in the College*, and the regular performance of Divine Service in the College Chapel. Here then was the influence of the Board manifestly thrown into the scale of Christianity and of vital piety, in the adoption of a measure certainly *intended*, as we most solemnly declare—

and we must think well *calculated* to exert a *controlling religious influence* over the institution.

Notwithstanding all the objections which have been urged against this proceeding, impartially and candidly considered, it affords conclusive evidence of a settled determination on the part of the Board, to meet the wishes of the religious community. Taken in connexion with the removal of Dr. COOPER, and the election of four new Professors, (not one of them tainted with even the suspicion of infidelity,) the almost unanimous election of the Rev. Dr. CAPERS to a Religious Professorship, left no doubt of the design of the Board, that "the prevailing influence" should be in favour of religion. No one has given the slightest reason to suspect that any of the new Professors would be disposed to exert a contrary influence. There is no ground whatever for such a suspicion—on the contrary, there is every reason to believe, that they would cheerfully and cordially co-operate with the Professor of Sacred Literature, in extending a wholesome religious influence over the institution. It would be their interest as well as their duty so to do. Public opinion, as well as the known wishes of the Trustees, would demand this at their hands, and it is hardly to be believed, that coming as strangers amongst us, they would be guilty of the egregious folly of creating obstacles in their own way. It is from Dr. LEIBER alone that opposition seems to have been apprehended, and this from the mistaken impression that he had vindicated what are called the "atheistical restrictions of the Gerard College," when in point of fact, his work on that subject contains an able argument to shew that RELIGION IS THE ONLY SAFE FOUNDATION OF MORALS, and that RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IS INDISPENSABLE to the prosperity of all literary institutions.

It has been stated as an objection to the influence of the Religious Professorship, that not being a regular Professorship, it must be less influential than the others, especially "as no duties have been assigned to it, but such as are odious and contemptible in the eyes of most students." Now with regard to the assignment of duties, it must be observed that this was left open, with a view to such an arrangement as might be deemed best calculated to give efficiency to the new Professorship, and should it be found expedient for this purpose, to add moral, or even intellectual Philosophy, or to make any other arrangement, we doubt not it would be done. We think it, however, a mistake to suppose, that a course of instruction in Sacred Literature and the Evidences of Christianity, accompanied by the stated performance of Divine Service in the College Chapel, by a learned, pious, and popular Clergyman, could possibly be "con-

temptible in the eyes of the students." Certain it is, that the Pastors of our Churches are not held in contempt by the youth of their flocks, and in this case, in addition to the respect to be derived from the sacred character of the office, and the regular performance of Divine Service—there would be *an authority* attached to the Professor as a member of the Faculty, and an instructor in the higher branches of biblical learning. This Professorship is no more an *extra* Professorship than Dr. LIEBER'S—they have indeed both been recently created,—but all the Professorships, in respect to tenure, salary, power and influence, stand precisely on the same footing.

From this brief statement of facts, it will, we trust, satisfactorily appear, that there was nothing in the creation or arrangement of the duties of the Professorship of Sacred Literature, calculated to impair the confidence of the Christian community—that there is no reason to believe that all the other Professors would not be disposed most cordially to co-operate in extending the influence of that Professor—and that so estimable a man as Dr. CAPERS, should have taken a different view of this matter, is to us a subject of great surprise, and of profound regret. With the highest possible respect for that gentleman, we cannot but think he is mistaken in supposing there is any thing in the character and duties of this Professorship, or in the present organization of the College, which might have impaired his influence, or presented obstacles in his way.* Certain it is, that the design of the Trustees was very far otherwise, and we have no hesitation in saying, that the Board will be ready to do whatever may be found necessary for strengthening and sustaining this Professorship, which, as it is second to none in dignity and im-

* It appears from a letter of Dr. Capers, to the Secretary of the Board, just published by himself, that immediately after his election, and "when he supposed that no reasonable exceptions could be taken on account" of the Professors, he objected to his new Professorship on the ground of the "vague and undefined terms (Sacred Literature) which had been chosen to designate it," and more especially on the ground "that as a Minister of a Church whose whole economy as to the Ministry is based on the principle that they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel, and *no more*; that he could not *bargain for his ministry*, that he might teach Philosophy for a price, but not Christ crucified." Now we are quite sure, that the duties of the Professorship would have been designated to the entire satisfaction of Dr. Capers; and if it had occurred to a single member of the Board that the addition of other duties would have made the office more acceptable to Dr. Capers, they would certainly have been added. As to the teaching religion for a price *beyond the mere means of living*, we suspect that the salary allowed the Professor would hardly have been liable to such an objection. We confess that we cannot see any substantial difference between receiving a reasonable compensation for teaching Moral Philosophy, or for delivering a course of Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity. At all events, we think Dr. Capers himself will hardly suspect the Board of any sinister design, in putting his Professorship on an equal footing in point of salary with the others; and if the Trustees, adopting the idea that the Professor of Sacred Literature should "live of his Professorship and *no more*," had allowed him but *one*, instead of two, thousand dollars, we should hardly have escaped the censure of those who have found in all the proceedings of the Board evidences of their "hostility to religion and the clergy." It is clear that it was not possible for the Trustees in this matter to avoid censure.

portance, should certainly be made to exert an influence that may be conducive to the temporal and eternal welfare of the students.

It will be proper before we conclude, to advert for a moment to the character and qualifications of the new Professors, in order that the public may judge whether their sons, may be safely committed to their instruction, in the several departments which they have undertaken to in teach.

DR. LIEBER.

The Governor of the State, in announcing to the public, as President of the Board of Trustees, the result of its proceedings, speaks of this gentlemen in the following flattering terms, deriving his information from the testimonials before the Board: "Dr. Francis Lieber of Philadelphia, has been elected Professor of Political Economy and History. From the very strong and unqualified recommendation of some of the profoundest scholars and distinguished men in Europe and America, as well as from the personal knowledge of some members of the Board, it is confidently believed that this gentleman will prove a very valuable acquisition to the science and literature of the State. He brings with him the most unqualified testimonials in his favour, of the great German historian Neibhur, whose favourite pupil he was, and the unusually earnest recommendation of Chancellor Kent, who expresses the opinion that he would be 'an ornament to any College in our country.'"

It is but an act of justice to Dr. Lieber to add, that the historian Neibhur states "that he knew Dr. L. intimately, that he had lived in his house a year, and that he could with perfect safety pronounce him to be a man whom nature had endowed with capacious talents, and eminent capacity to penetrate whatever his attention is directed to."

Chancellor Kent too, speaks of him as "a gentleman of great learning, and probity, and worth, and that his name, his character, his talents, his learning, and great moral worth, eminently qualified him for the *Presidency* of our College, and would elevate the reputation of any University in our country."

The Hon. John Sergeant of Pennsylvania, strongly recommends Dr. Lieber for the *Presidency* of our College stating "that he was well acquainted with him, that he is a gentleman of extensive and solid acquirements, great industry, excellent general capacity, and an admirable moral character, with a large acquaintance with the world and the manners and habits of the best society."

Judge Story speaks of him as a gentleman "whom he has known for several years, and pronounces him an excellent scholar, learned, and of uncommon enthusiasm and strength of mind, devoted to literary pursuits and accustomed to laborious study, particularly, well versed in statistics, *history*, and moral philosophy; speaking the English language with great fluency and writing it very well." "I hardly know a man, (says he,) more likely to have a useful influence over young minds."

Passing over the testimonials of the Hon. Edward Livingston, the Hon. Joseph Ingersoll, Nicholas Biddle, and others which our space will barely permit us to notice, we will conclude with an extract from the recommendation of our own fellow-citizen, Col. William Drayton, now a resident of Philadelphia, than whom we certainly know of no one entitled to greater respect and consideration. He speaks of Dr. Lieber's "various accomplishments and attainments, both in private life, and as a public instructor, which in the opinion of the most distinguished literary and scientific gentlemen in the United States, EMINENTLY QUALIFY HIM FOR THE PRESIDENCY OF A COLLEGE."

After reading these recommendations, is there any candid man who will state that the election of Dr. Lieber, who was also known to be a *professor*

of religion, affords any evidence of a disregard on the part of the Trustees of the interests of the Institution committed to their care.

DR. ELLET.

The next on the list is Dr. Ellet. Of this gentleman the Governor speaks as follows: "Dr. Wm. H. Ellet of N. Y. has been elected Professor Chymistry and Geology. He came before the Board, sustained by the most unequivocal testimonials of eminent and peculiar qualifications for his department, from almost every Professor, and from many other distinguished men in New-York. He has contributed some profound articles to Dr. Silliman's Journal, and the Board discovered, from an inspection of a correspondence between him and Dr. Silliman, in relation to one of these articles, that the latter entertained the highest respect and utmost deference for the opinions of the former, on some very difficult points of investigation in the science of Chymistry."

To go a little more into detail, we would remark that Dr. Ellet was highly recommended by many of the most distinguished men in the United States, and among them, by no less than eighteen Presidents, and Professors of Colleges, and eight Professors of Natural Science, as a gentleman "*eminently qualified*" for the office to which he has been appointed. Among them were Professor Silliman, President Duer, Professors Renwich, Gale, Francis, Anthon, Moore, Anderson, Beck, McVicar, Rogers, J. Henry, and Usher. Doctors McNeven, Busche, Hosack, Francis, Rhineland, Hart, Peixotte, Cooper, Chilton, Mr. Riker, Mr. DeKay, Mr. Griscome, Mr. Huddant, Mr. Robert Walsh, Mr. H. Allen, Mr. J. Webster, Mr. Boyd, Bishop Onderdonk, Mr. G. C. Verplanck, &c.

These gentlemen speak of Dr. Ellet, as having been a Professor in Columbia College, New-York, "in which station he had given entire satisfaction to all concerned—ranking high as a general scholar—who had been long known as an able and successful teacher of Chymistry and Mineralogy—that he had been a lecturer for five years, and had acquired a reputation, few men enjoy of his age, that he is ambitious of distinction in his profession, and is well fitted by education, talents and practical knowledge for a professorship—who had great ability and success in instructing the classes committed to his care—as a chemist his talents are eminent—his acquaintance with the subject extensive, and practical, and expert in manipulation; in short, he is considered as the most accomplished chymist in the State, very dexterous in manipulation, with a distinct and easy elocution—in scientific acquirements, having no superior of his age in this country, and few, if any, that are his equals—one of the very first Chymists in our country," &c.

Dr. Hosack declares "that from a long acquaintance, he can speak in the most positive terms as to his talents and qualifications," and that in the new School of Medicine, (which Dr. Hosack, Mott, and others had designed to establish in the City of New-York,) "the chair of Chymistry, was to have been given to Dr. Ellet."

Professor Usher, Professor of the Medical College of Ohio, states, "that he had daily intercourse with Dr. Ellet in his chymical laboratory for more than four years, and he unhesitatingly declares that he knows of no individual who possesses a more accurate knowledge of the philosophy of chymistry, or is more thoroughly versed in its practical details; that to this intercourse, more than to information derived from any other source, he owes his own proficiency in some of the most difficult departments of the science;" "I have heard, (adds he,) some of the best chymists say the same thing. I know that the entire management of the experimental illustrations were confided to him, and I have heard Dr. McNeven, Professor Renwich, and Dr. Torrey, give his views on disputed topics in preference to those previously entertained by themselves, and to

such as were contained in the books. As a specimen of the ingenuity of Dr. Ellet's reasoning, and the novelty of his views on such subjects, I would refer to his essay on Cyanogen, which obtained the gold medal from Rutgers's College, and was published in Silliman's Journal." To all which it may be added, that Dr. Ellet is represented to be "a gentleman of courteous demeanour, and amiable manners, an excellent man, most exemplary in private life, and highly esteemed;" and to crown the whole it was stated that he was possessed of an excellent and accomplished wife, distinguished for her literary attainments, and well calculated to exert a high moral influence, in the station in which she is about to be placed. We are happy to be able to add, that all the Professors are equally fortunate in this respect.

MR. STUART.

We come next to the Professor of Languages, Mr. Isaac W. Stuart, late Principal of the Beaufort College. The following were the recommendations of Professor Stuart. President *Day*, and Professors *Silliman* and *Goodrich*, of Yale College, certified "that Mr. Stuart was graduated at that College in 1828—that he sustained a high rank among the most distinguished in his class, in talents and literary attainments, and excelled particularly in the ancient languages; and was, in their opinion, qualified to give instructions in the higher departments of Ancient Literature."—President *Woods*, of the Theological Seminary at Andover, certified "that he had been acquainted with Mr. Stuart from a child—(he is the son of Professor Stuart, of that Institution)—that he has uniformly exhibited talents of a high order, and is distinguished for his acquisitions in the languages and in polite literature." "I consider him (says he) qualified in an uncommon degree for the Professorship of Languages in any College." "I have not known any one (says Mr. L. Wood, Jr.) who possesses greater natural facility in making literary acquisitions, or more ardour in the pursuit of knowledge." The Trustees of the Beaufort College in this State, on hearing that Mr. Stuart's name was to be brought before the Board, met, and unanimously "*Resolved*, That they take great pleasure in stating, that Mr. Isaac W. Stuart has for the two years last past been acting as Principal of the Institution under their charge; that as a gentleman and a teacher he has given them great satisfaction: that upon frequent examination of the boys under his charge, in such authors as Horace, Cicero, Sallust, Euripides and Sophocles, they were fully satisfied with their instruction; and that he was peculiarly happy in imparting a taste for learning to the youths under his charge."

Dr. Thomas Fuller, the President of the Board, in conveying this testimonial, stated "that the Trustees entertained the highest respect for Mr. Stuart as a gentleman, a scholar and a teacher—that they felt great regret at his discontinuing his valuable services in Beaufort, and he expresses the deep solicitude of himself and his colleagues for the success of the South-Carolina College—the *Alma Mater* of the moral and political, as well as the intellectual character of the youth of Carolina, and hopes the Trustees may only be so fortunate as to place in their other vacant chairs men as well qualified to fill them, as Mr. Stuart is for that for which he applies."

We have next the recommendation of the *Hon. Wm. Grayson*, the Member of Congress from Beaufort and Colleton Districts, a gentleman as distinguished for his talents as for his fervent piety, and great worth. Mr. Grayson states, "that he knew Mr. Stuart intimately, and has had a full opportunity to appreciate his worth,—that he has had a boy under his care,—that his qualifications are so superior, that being solicitous to see the South-Carolina College in a flourishing condition, he feels it an act not more of justice to Mr. Stuart, than of attachment to the State, to bear testimony in his behalf." "I never met (says Mr. Grayson) with a man who more happily combined the qualities of a gentleman and scholar, nor

one who has more of that judgment to instruct, and talents to govern young men, without which learning and every other excellence in a teacher are thrown away and useless."

Mr. William Elliott, of Beaufort, voluntarily, and unknown to Mr. Stuart, forwarded a recommendation, substantially to the same effect, adding that he considered him "a gentleman of distinguished merit, with a mind of superior order, highly cultivated and stored with classical learning,—in his intellectual habits a hard student, and in his morals above suspicion; and on the whole deems him uncommonly qualified to become the guide and instructor of our Southern youth."

Robert Barnwell Smith, our Attorney-General, concurred in these recommendations, and states "that he considers Mr. Stuart as in all respects worthy of being elected to the vacant professorship."

The *Hon. Robt. W. Barnwell* concurred in their views as to Mr. Stuart's eminent qualifications for this professorship. He states "that he had taught the languages in the Beaufort College for two years, and had given very high satisfaction,—that the examinations had been frequent and critical, and that he had always been highly pleased with the skill of the instructor, and the proficiency of the scholars. That Mr. Stuart possessed a peculiar aptitude for imparting knowledge, and inspiring a love of study, as well by the equanimity and kindness of his conduct towards his pupils, as by his own enthusiasm; and on the whole Mr. Barnwell declared that he considered Mr. Stuart eminently qualified by his acquirements, manners, and character to conciliate the esteem of young gentlemen, and to exercise over them a strong influence in favour of studious habits and ripe scholarship."

Mr. Albert Moore Smith, (who had known Mr. Stuart at College) testified "that he did not think a more competent individual could be found anywhere. That he could vouch for his acquaintance not only with the Greek and Latin languages, but with German, French and Hebrew, and to crown the whole, that although Mr. Stuart was born in Massachusetts, he had lived long at the South, admired the people—was enthusiastically attached to our institutions—had married here, was a man of independent fortune; and that he was influenced only by his ardent devotion to letters and a literary ambition, to desire the office which was sought for him."

Such were the recommendations of Mr. Stuart, and yet in yielding to *claims thus supported* the Trustees are charged with having betrayed their trust, and manifested a determination to subject the College to an "irreligious influence," inasmuch as they were informed that Mr. Stuart "had no pretensions to religion." Now it is true that one of the gentlemen above-named did state in his letter to the Board that Mr. Stuart was not a "religious man." The Board inquired into this objection, and were informed that nothing more was meant than that Mr. S. was not a professor of religion, but that with the knowledge of this fact, he had been elected Principal of the Beaufort College, by a Board of Trustees consisting of religious men, and of which, the gentleman who stated this objection was himself a member: that this Board parted with him very reluctantly, and they all concurred in *recommending him for this professorship*.

MR. TWISS.

The last on our list is the Professor of Mathematics Mr. Thomas S. Twiss, of New-York. This gentleman was educated at the Military Academy at West Point, where one of our Trustees, who was several years since, President of the Board of Examiners, well remembers him as an Assistant Professor, so *particularly distinguished*, that he was specially recommended to the War Department.

Colonel Thayer, the late Superintendent, a gentleman whose recommendation on such a subject, should certainly go as far as that of any man in America, certifies "that Mr. Twiss was educated at the Military Academy at West Point while under his superintendence; was graduated in 1826, and received a commission in the corps of *Engineers*, as a reward for his distinguished merit. He was retained at the Institution as an Assistant Professor until he was ordered to enter upon the active duties of his profession. He is a gentleman of unimpeachable character, and in my opinion eminently qualified to fill the chair of Mathematics in your College."

Professors Davies, Hopkins, and Bartlett, (the only Professors, now at West Point, under whom Mr. Twiss studied, the first named gentleman being the distinguished Professor of Mathematics, to whom the vacant chair in our College was last year tendered,) have all concurred in testifying "that Mr. Twiss is highly qualified for a professorship of Mathematics, and that they feel entire confidence in presenting his name to the Board, as they cannot doubt that he would make a distinguished Professor." They bear testimony "to his high moral and intellectual character,"—they state, "that he was graduated second in his class, and was commissioned in the *Engineers*; an appointment only conferred on graduates of the most distinguished merit—that even during his cadetship he was one of the acting Assistant Professors, and after he graduated was for three years an Assistant Professor in the Institution, that during his whole course as a teacher, the attainments of his pupils gave as clear evidence of his zeal and skill in imparting knowledge, as his own high scholarship had before given of his talents and industry—and that his honorable and amiable deportment secured for him numerous friends, whose attachment and esteem will be for life,"—they further add, "that as Mr. Twiss is one of the most distinguished graduates of the Military Academy, and having been much engaged in the business of instruction, they believe his services would be calculated in a high degree to advance the interests, and from his peculiar qualifications to add much to the reputation of the College; and that in their opinion the appointment of Mr. Twiss is the very best that could be made from among those of whom they have any knowledge, and whose services could be commended." Such were the recommendations of Mr. Twiss, whom the opponents of the College set down as a *cypher*! With what justice let an impartial public now determine.

It is worthy of remark that while such strong objections are urged against the Professors of the College collectively, their opponents have been constrained to do justice, to most of them individually. Professor Nott is admitted to be "a gentleman and a scholar." Professors Ellet and Stuart are acknowledged to be men "eminent for their qualifications, and who ought to be sustained;" while of Dr. Lieber, it is declared "that his intellectual, literary, and moral character, is unexceptionable."

Such is the character of the new Professors of our College. Two vacancies remain to be filled—the Professorship of Sacred Literature, and the Professorship of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy. Dr. CAPERS having declined the former, his place will unquestionably be filled by some able, eloquent and truly pious Clergyman, capable of meeting the wishes of the Trustees, and the expectations of the public. Nothing, we are sure, could give the Trustees greater pleasure than to fill up the Presidency, also, with a gentleman of

extensive learning, commanding talents, well established reputation, of amiable temper and popular manners, with a talent for government; and withal possessed of a high, religious character. If these qualities be found in any individual, whether he be a Clergyman or a layman, we presume the Trustees could not possibly err in advancing him to the Presidency. In every event we fearlessly pledge ourselves that nothing will be either *done* or *suffered*, to introduce an anti-religious influence into the Institution; but, on the contrary, that every proper effort will be made to give it such a direction as may satisfy the feelings and reasonable wishes of the Christian community. Claiming to be Christians ourselves, and living among a Christian people, we should be of course disposed to go very far to satisfy the claims, and remove the scruples of religious men of any and every denomination. The College, however, never can, under its present organization, and while supported by the State, be converted into a sectarian or ecclesiastical Institution. Yet the religion which is professed, or venerated in some form, by a great majority of the people of the State, is entitled to respectful consideration, and opportunities of instruction in it should certainly be afforded. So far from considering it an objection that a professor should be a clergyman, supposing an equality of qualification, we should rather prefer a clergyman to a layman, and we think it desirable, that there should always be one or two clergymen among the Faculty.—The public would be better satisfied that it should be so. With able and scientific men in every department, men of sound principles, gentlemanly habits, and approved morals—with sound, religious instruction, provided for the children of Christian parents, and a President of the character we have described, we have no fears for the success of our College. We are persuaded that nothing but public confidence is now wanting to ensure this auspicious result. We earnestly call, therefore, upon those who are unhappily striving to deprive the College of that confidence and support, without which it cannot exist, to pause in their career. In endeavouring to persuade Christian parents not to send their sons to the South-Carolina College, they are unconsciously undermining the very pillars of the State. Already has a visible improvement taken place in the morals and manners of the students; let the experiment under the new organization be fairly made, and we have no fears for the result. Let the character and qualifications of the new Professors be tested—let the Professorship of Sacred Literature, DO ITS OFFICE, and let the Presidency be filled, as we have no doubt it will be, by an able, pious, learned, and popular man; let

the regulations now in progress, for the introduction of an improved system of instruction, discipline and police, be carried into full effect, and we are perfectly satisfied that the College will realize public expectations. In behalf of the Trustees and Professors—in behalf of the College, and in behalf of the State—we APPEAL TO YOU, fellow-citizens, and say, GIVE US YOUR CONFIDENCE, and we will venture to promise, that the South-Carolina College will rise from its ruins like the lately dilapidated walls of the edifice—in renovated grace and beauty—to become the PRIDE and ORNAMENT, the BLESSING and GLORY of the STATE. We declare to you, fellow-citizens, our conviction that it is the sincere desire of the Trustees to remove all just grounds of objection to the College ; that at the late elections they did endeavour faithfully to perform their duties, with a single eye to the welfare of the College ; and surely we may expect some degree of credit, when we say so in the sincerity of truth and good faith.

That Christian parents may, in our opinion, safely send their sons to our College, cannot, perhaps, be more strongly expressed, than by stating the fact, that one of the Subscribers had been induced by circumstances, to which it is not necessary to advert, to send his sons to the Virginia University, but such is his confidence in the character and qualifications of the Professors elected, that he has brought them home, and they will apply for admission into our College next month. This Appeal has been made with the concurrence and approbation of all the members of the Board of Trustees who could be conveniently consulted.

— **ROBERT Y. HAYNE,**
HENRY W. DESAUSSURE,
DAVID JOHNSON,
WILLIAM HARPER,
PATRICK NOBLE.

Charleston, September 18, 1835.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 028 340 323 3